

REMARKS

Claims 1-47 are currently pending in the application. Claims 48-50 have been newly added. Therefore, claims 1-50 are pending.

The Examiner objected to Figure 4 as containing a typographical error in that the word “Transalator” should read “Translator.” A corrected drawing (Figure 4) sheet is filed herewith in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) with the word “Translator” correctly spelled. The corrected Figure 4 is labeled “Corrected Sheet”. No new matter has been added as a result to the amendments to the drawings.

The Examiner rejected claims 2-20, 26-31, 33-37, 46-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In light of the amendments and arguments provided herein, this rejection is now moot and claims 2-20, 26-31, 33-37, 46-47 are allowable.

Applicant has amended claims 2-8, 10-20, 26-31, 33-37, 46-47 to address the Examiner’s concerns regarding 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Regarding claim 9, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 9 is not confusing since the term “said first of pair transistors” are called for in claim 2, from which claim 9 indirectly depends. Regardless of the transistors 520 and 570, the “first pair of transistors” are coupled to the first and second transistors, as called for by claim 1. Claim 9 narrows this limitation such that the “first pair of transistors” are coupled to the drain terminal of the first and second transistors. Therefore, those skilled in the art having benefit of the present disclosure would readily understand the limitations of claim 1. All other claims have been amended to address the Examiner’s rejections as to indefiniteness. Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 2-20, 26-31, 33-37, 46-47 are allowable.

The Examiner objected to claims 30 and 31 under 37 C.F.R. 1.75 as being duplicative of claims 15 and 16. Claims 15 and 16 call for circuits. In contrast, claims 30 and 31 (as amended) call for voltage translators. Therefore, claims 30 and 31 (as amended) are no longer duplicative of claims 15 and 16. Accordingly, claims 30 and 31 (as well as claims 15 and 16) are all allowable.

The Examiner objected to claims 27-29 under 37 C.F.R 1.75 as being duplicative of claims 27-29. As a result of Examiner's typographical error, this rejection is confusing. However, claims 27-29 have been amended to correct typographical errors. Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 27-29 are not duplicative of any other claims and are allowable.

Applicant acknowledges and appreciates that the Examiner has allowed claims 1, 21-25, 32 and 38-45. In light of the arguments and amendments presented herein, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 2-20, 26-31, 33-37, 46-47 are also allowable. Additionally, Applicant respectfully assert that newly added claims 48-50 contain novel subject matter that is not taught disclosed or suggested by prior art. Therefore, claims 48-50 are also allowable.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, **the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Houston, Texas telephone number (713) 934-4069** to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAMS, MORGAN & AMERSON, P.C.
CUSTOMER NO. 23720

Date: July 5, 2005

By:



Jason C. John, Reg. 50,737
10333 Richmond, Suite 1100
Houston, Texas 77042
(713) 934-4069
(713) 934-7011 (facsimile)
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

AMENDMENTS TO DRAWINGS

The Examiner objected to Figure 4 as containing a typographical error in that the word “Transalator” should read “Translator.” A corrected drawing (Figure 4) sheet is filed herewith in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) with the word “Translator” correctly spelled. The corrected Figure 4 is labeled “Corrected Sheet”.